arXiv:1510.06797v1 [math.OC] 23 Oct 2015

Alternative Linear and Second-order Cone Approximation Approaches for Polynomial Optimization

Xiaolong Kuang * Bissan Ghaddar † Joe Naoum-Sawaya ‡
Luis F. Zuluaga §

October 26, 2015

Abstract

In theory, hierarchies of semidefinite programming (SDP) relaxations based on sum of squares (SOS) polynomials have been shown to provide arbitrarily close approximations to general polynomial optimization problems (POP). However, due to the computational challenge of solving SDPs, it becomes difficult to use SDP hierarchies for large-scale problems. To address this, hierarchies of second-order cone programming (SOCP) relaxations resulting from a restriction of the SOS polynomial condition have been recently proposed to approximate POPs. Here, we consider alternative ways to use these SOCP restriction of the SOS condition. In particular, we show that SOCP hierarchies can be effectively used to strengthen hierarchies of linear programming (LP) relaxations for POPs. Specifically, we show that this solution approach is substantially more effective in finding solutions of certain POPs for which the more common hierarchies of SDP relaxations are known to perform poorly. Also, we use hierarchies of LP relaxations for POPs that allows us to show that the SOCP approach can be used to obtain hierarchies of SOCPs that converge to the optimal value of the POP when its feasible set is compact. Additionally, we show that the SOCP approach can be used to address the solution of the fundamental alternating current optimal power flow (ACOPF) problem. In particular, we show that the first-order SOCP hierarchy obtained by weakening the more common hierarchy of SDP relaxations for this problem is equivalent to solving the conic dual of the SOCP approximations recently proposed to address the ACOPF problem. Through out the article, we illustrate our findings with relevant experimental results. In the case of the ACOPF problem, we use well-known instances of the problem that appear in the related literature.

Keywords Polynomial optimization, linear relaxation, second-order cone relaxation, semidefinite relaxation, alternating current optimal power flow.

1 Introduction

Many real-world problems can be modeled as a polynomial optimization problem (POP); that is, an optimization problem in which both the objective and constraints are multivariate polynomials on the decision variables. Thus devising new approaches to globally solve polynomial

*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, USA. E-mail: xik312@lehigh.edu

†IBM Research–Ireland, Dublin, Ireland. E-mail: bghaddar@uwaterloo.ca

‡IBM Research–Ireland, Dublin, Ireland. E-mail: jnaoumsa@uwaterloo.ca

§Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, USA. E-mail: luis.zuluaga@lehigh.edu

problems is an active area of research [see, e.g., 2, 4, for excellent recent surveys on this area]. In a recent line of research, Lasserre [20] showed that *semidefinite programming* (SDP) [cf., 32] relaxations based on *sum of square* (SOS) polynomials [cf., 4] can provide global bounds for polynomial optimization problems. However, the SDP constraints are computationally expensive and thus even using low-orders of the hierarchy to approximate large-scale polynomial optimization problems becomes computationally intractable in practice [22]. To improve the computational performance of the SDP based hierarchies to approximate the solution of POPs, prior work has focused on exploiting the problem structure through sparsity [19] and symmetry [9, 10], improving the relaxation through generating valid inequalities [14], and more recently through devising more computationally efficient hierarchies such as linear programming (LP) and second-order cone programming (SOCP) hierarchies [1, 13, 28].

Here, we consider alternative ways to use SOCP restrictions of the SOS condition introduced in Ahmadi and Majumdar [1]. In particular, we show that SOCP hierarchies can be effectively used to strengthen hierarchies of linear programming relaxations for general POPs. Such hierarchies of LP relaxations have received little attention in the POP literature (a few noworthy exceptions are [8, 21, 34]). However, in this paper we show that this solution approach is substantially more effective in finding solutions of certain POPs for which the more common hierarchies of SDP relaxations are known to perform poorly [cf., 13]. Also, we use hierarchies of LP relaxations for POPs that allows us to show that the SOCP approach can be used to obtain hierarchies of SOCPs that converge to the optimal value of the POP when its feasible set is compact. Note that for the well-known SDP based hierarchies based in the seminal work of Lasserre [20], the feasible set of the POP is required to be *Archimedean* [cf., 4] which implies the compactness of the POP feasible set.

Additionally, we show that the SOCP approach that is proposed in this paper can be used to address the solution of the fundamental alternating current optimal power flow (ACOPF) problem. Recently, there has been very active research work on using *convex optimization* [cf. 6], and polynomial optimization in order to obtain globally optimal solutions for this non-linear and non-convex optimization problem. Some examples of research in this direction are the work in [5, 12, 23, 24, 26]. In this direction, we show that the first-order SOCP hierarchy obtained by weakening the more common hierarchy of SDP relaxations for this problem is equivalent to solving the conic dual of the SOCP approximations that have been recently proposed to address the ACOPF problem [5]. In turn, the SOCP hierarchy approach provides a natural hierarchy of increasingly stronger SOCP approximations for the ACOPF problem.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. We briefly review several convex approximations of POPs in Section 2. The proposed approximation strategies and hierarchies are presented in Section 3. The application of the proposed approaches to the ACOPF problem is discussed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 provides concluding remarks and future research directions.

2 Preliminaries

The following notation is used throughout the paper: let $\mathbf{R}_d[x] := \mathbf{R}_d[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be the set of polynomials in n variables with real coefficients of degree at most d. Given any $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbf{R}_d[x]$, let $S_{\mathcal{G}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(x) \geq 0, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}\}$. We define

$$SOS_{2d} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i(x)^2 : p_i(x) \in \mathbf{R}_d[x], k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \right\},$$

as the cone of sum of square polynomials in x of degree at most d . For any $S \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\mathcal{P}_d(S)$ be the cone of polynomials of degree at most d that are non-negative over the set S [cf., 4]. We consider the following general polynomial program,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{[PP-P]} \quad \min \quad & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g_i(x) \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\mathcal{G} = \{g_i(x) : i = 1, \ldots, m\}$, [PP-P] can be equivalently rewritten as the following *conic program* [cf., 6],

$$\begin{aligned} \text{[PP-D]} \quad \max \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}}). \end{aligned}$$

In general, solving [PP-P] is NP-hard [27]. Problem [PP-D] is a (linear) conic program whosecomplexity is captured in the cone $\mathcal{P}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}})$, which is not tractable in general. Considering a tractable convex cone $\mathcal{M}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}})$, then the following convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \text{[PP-M]} \quad \max \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \lambda \in \mathcal{M}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}}) \end{aligned}$$

provides a lower bound for [PP-D], and hence a lower bound for [PP-P]. The choice of the tractable cone $\mathcal{M}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}})$ is a key factor in obtaining good approximation bounds for [PP-D], and in turn [PP-P].

In his seminal work, Lasserre [20] proposed a hierarchy of relaxations that builds up a sequence of SDPs over the cone $\mathcal{K}^r_{\mathcal{G}}$ to approximate $\mathcal{P}_d(S_{\mathcal{G}})$, where

$$\mathcal{K}^r_{\mathcal{G}} = \left\{ p(x) \in \mathbf{R}_r[x] : p(x) = s_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i(x) g_i(x), s_0(x) \in SOS_r, s_i(x) \in SOS_{r-\deg(g_i)} \right\}, \tag{1}$$

and $r > 0$ is the level of the hierarchy. The corresponding optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{[PP-SOS}_r\text{]} \quad \max_{\lambda, s_0(x), \ldots, s_m(x)} \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \lambda = s_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i(x) g_i(x), \\ & s_0(x) \in SOS_r, s_i(x) \in SOS_{r-\deg(g_i)}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Problem (2) is a SOS polynomial optimization problem, which can be reformulated as a SDP [cf., 4]. Under some conditions related to the compactness of the set $S_{\mathcal{G}}$ (more precisely, when the *quadratic module* generated by the set of polynomials $\mathcal{G}$ is *Archimedean*), the hierarchy of problems [PP-SOS$_r$] converges to the global solution of [PP-P] as $r \to \infty$ [20]. However, as r increases, the size of the positive semidefinite matrices required to reformulate [PP-SOS$_r$] as a SDP increases exponentially. As a result, this approach is computationally expensive for large-scale problems or even for small-scale problems that require the solution of high levels of the hierarchy to obtain good approximations for the solution of the problem of interest.

Ahmadi and Majumdar [1] recently proposed a restriction of the SOS condition to address this shortcoming of the SDP based hierarchies. The restriction of the SOS condition is done by introducing the use of *diagonally dominant sum of square* (DSOS) polynomials instead of SOS polynomials in [PP-SOS$_r$].

Definition 1 (DSOS polynomials (Ahmadi and Majumdar [1]))**.** *Let J be an index set, $m_i(x) \in \mathbf{R}_d[x]$ be a monomial in $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ for all $i \in J$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $i, j \in J$. Then*

$$p(x) = \sum_i \alpha_i m_i(x)^2 + \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij}(m_i(x) \pm m_j(x))^2, \tag{3}$$

is a diagonally dominant sum of square polynomial (DSOS) in $\mathbf{R}_{2d}[x]$. Equivalently, DSOS polynomials can be defined as those that can be constructed from a diagonally dominant matrix *(DD). Namely, let $z(x)$ be a vector with the monomials $m_i(x)$ for all $i \in J$, and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|\times|J|}$ be a (symmetric) diagonally dominant matrix. Then $p(x) = z^T(x)Qz(x)$ is a DSOS.*

Let $DSOS_{n,2d}$ be the set of all DSOS polynomial in n variables of degree $2d$. Then it is clear from (3) that $DSOS_{n,d} \subseteq SOS_{n,d}$. Thus, using DSOS polynomials instead of SOS polynomials in [PP-SOS$_r$] provides a hierarchy of lower bounds for the SOS hierarchy. Moreover the resulting DSOS hierarchy is computationally easier to solve. Namely, recall that a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is DD if $A_{ii} \geq \sum_{j\neq i} |A_{ij}|, \forall i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus the associated DSOS hierarchy

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{PP-}\underline{\text{DSOS}}_r] \quad \max_{\lambda, s_i(x)} \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \lambda = d_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i(x) g_i(x), \\ & d_0(x) \in DSOS_r, d_i(x) \in DSOS_{r-\deg(g_i)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

can be reformulated as a LP. To emphasize the fact that this hierarchy provides a lower bound on the [PP-SOS$_r$] hierarchy by restricting the set of SOS polynomials to those that are DSOS, we use the underline notation in (4).

As proposed by Ahmadi and Majumdar [1], the DSOS hierarchy [PP-$\underline{\text{DSOS}}_r$] can be strengthened by considering *scaled diagonally dominant sum of square* (SDSOS) polynomials.

Definition 2 (SDSOS polynomials (Ahmadi and Majumdar [1]))**.** *Let J be an index set, $m_i(x) \in \mathbf{R}_d[x]$ be a monomial in $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ for all $i \in J$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $i, j \in J$. Then*

$$p(x) = \sum_i \alpha_i m_i(x)^2 + \sum_{i,j} (\beta_i m_i(x) \pm \beta_j m_j(x))^2, \tag{5}$$

is a scaled diagonally dominant sum of square polynomial (SDSOS) in $\mathbf{R}_{2d}[x]$. Equivalently, SDSOS polynomials can be defined as those that can be constructed from a scaled diagonally dominant matrix *(SDD). Namely, let $z(x)$ be a vector with the monomials $m_i(x)$ for all $i \in J$, and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|\times|J|}$ be a (symmetric) scaled diagonally dominant matrix. Then $p(x) = z^T(x)Qz(x)$ is a DSOS.*

Let $SDSOS_{n,2d}$ be the set of all SDSOS polynomial in n variables of degree $2d$. Then it is clear from (5) that $DSOS_{n,d} \subseteq SDSOS_{n,d} \subseteq SOS_{n,d}$. Thus, using SDSOS polynomials instead of SOS polynomials in [PP-SOS$_r$] provides a hierarchy of lower bounds for the SOS hierarchy that is stronger than the [PP-$\underline{\text{DSOS}}_r$]. Moreover the resulting SDSOS hierarchy is computationally easier to solve. Namely, notice that a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is SDD if

$$A = \sum_{i,j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} A^{ij}, \text{ for some } A^{ij} \succeq 0, \text{ with } A^{ij}_{kl} = 0 \text{ for any } k, l \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j\}. \tag{6}$$

Above, we use the common notation $A \succeq 0$ to indicate that the matrix is positive semidefinite of appropriate size. Notice that because the A^{ij} matrices in (6) have only nonzero elements at positions $l, k \in \{i, j\}$, then it follows that

$$A^{ij} \succeq 0 \iff \begin{pmatrix} A^{ij}_{ii} & A^{ij}_{ij} \\ A^{ij}_{ji} & A^{ij}_{jj} \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0 \iff A^{ij}_{ii} A^{ij}_{jj} \geq (A^{ij}_{ij})^2, A^{ij}_{ii}, A^{ij}_{jj} \geq 0$$
$$\iff \frac{A^{ij}_{ii} + A^{ij}_{jj}}{2} \geq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A^{ij}_{ij} \\ \frac{A^{ij}_{ii} - A^{ij}_{jj}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 . \tag{7}$$
$$\iff \begin{pmatrix} \frac{A^{ij}_{ii} + A^{ij}_{jj}}{2} \\ A^{ij}_{ij} \\ \frac{A^{ij}_{ii} - A^{ij}_{jj}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Ł}^3,$$

where Ł^n denotes the *second-order cone* or *Lorentz cone* of dimension n [cf., 6]. Thus the associated SDSOS hierarchy

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{PP-}\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r] \quad \max_{\lambda, s_i(x)} \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \lambda = d_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i(x) g_i(x), \\ & d_0(x) \in SDSOS_r, d_i(x) \in SDSOS_{r - \deg(g_i)}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

can be reformulated as a second-order cone program. To emphasize the fact that this hierarchy provides a lower bound on the [PP-SOS$_r$] hierarchy by restricting the set of SOS polynomials to those that are SDSOS, we use the underline notation in (8).

Ahmadi and Majumdar [1] have shown that the approximation hierarchies (4) and (8) can be successfully used to approximate polynomial optimization problems arising in control, combinatorics, and general non-linear non-convex optimization. In this paper (see Section 4), we use this approach to address the solution of the fundamental alternating current optimal power flow (ACOPF) problem. In the following section, however, we show how alternative hierarchies that effectively approximate POPs can be constructed using DSOS and SDSOS polynomials to strengthen hierarchies of linear programming relaxations for POPs.

3 Alternative Hierarchies for Polynomial Optimization

Lasserre's hierarchy [20] has been shown to provide very tight bounds for multiple classes of POPs. However, this approach becomes computationally intractable for large-scale problems or even for small-scale problems that require the solution of high levels of the hierarchy to obtain good approximations for the solution of the problem of interest. Loosely speaking, this intractability stems from the fact that the size of the SDP reformulation of the SOS conditions in [PP-SOS$_r$] grows exponentially with the dimension of the decision variables of the problem n, as well as the level of the hierarchy r.

A key building block behind the convergence properties of the hierarchy defined by [PP-SOS$_r$] is a representation theorem for polynomials in $\mathcal{P}_d(S_\mathcal{G})$ by Putinar [29] that makes use of SOS polynomials [cf., 4, 20]. Other hierarchies of convergent SDP hierarchies can be constructed similarly using the representation theorem by Schmüdgen [30], when the set $S_\mathcal{G}$ is compact. Besides these SOS representation theorems, there are however well-known representations theorems for non-negative polynomials that use polynomials with non-negative coefficients (instead of SOS polynomials) in the representation. Examples of these are the representation theorem of Hardy et al. [15], when the set $S_\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{R}^n_+$, or Pólay's Theorem [cf., 15], when the set $S_\mathcal{G}$ is a polytope.

Theorem 1 (Pólya [15]). *Let $p(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n[x]$ be a multivariate polynomial. Then $p(x) > 0$ for all $x \geq 0 \Rightarrow (1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^r p(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} c_\alpha x^\alpha$, for some $r \geq 0$, $c_\alpha \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$.*

In stating Theorem 1, we make use of the common notation $x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Note that in Theorem 1, the non-negativity of the polynomial is certified using polynomials with non-negative coefficients. As a result, this type of representation theorems can be used to construct hierarchies of LP problems that converge to the optimal solution of [PP-P] (when the required conditions on the set $S_\mathcal{G}$ are satisfied). Such approach has been used in [8, 21, 34].

Here, we take advantage of this type of "computationally cheaper" LP hierarchy approach to address the solution of certain classes of POPs for which the more common SDP hierarchy is known to perform poorly [cf., 13]. In particular, we use a representation theorem for non-negative polynomials in a semi-algebraic set recently introduced in [28] to construct a converging hierarchy of LPs to address the solution of [PP-P]. Formally, consider the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{PP-LP}_r] \quad z_{r,LP} := \max \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j(x)\right)^r (f(x) - \lambda) = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{I}} c_{\alpha,\beta} x^\alpha g(x)^\beta \qquad (9) \\ & c_{\alpha,\beta} \geq 0 \text{ for all } (\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{I} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} := \{(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+m} : \|(\alpha,\beta)\|_1 = r \max\{\deg(g) : g \in \mathcal{G}\} + \deg(f)\}.$$

By matching the coefficients of each monomial of x in the left-hand side and the right-hand side of equation (9), the resulting problem is a LP with decision variables $\lambda, c_{\alpha,\beta}$, for all $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{I}$. Similar to the [PP-SOS$_r$] hierarchy, but under milder conditions, the resulting bound $z_{r,LP}$ of [PP-LP$_r$], obtained at each level of the hierarchy improves as r increases. In particular,

Theorem 2 (Peña et al. [28]). *Let $S_\mathcal{G} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : g_i(x) \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, m\}$ be a compact set, then as $r \to \infty$, $z_{r,LP}$ converges to the global optimum of [PP-P].*

Thus, Theorem 2 provides the convergence guarantee of hierarchy (9) to a POP with a compact feasible set in $\mathbb{R}^+_n$, which allows us to use LP techniques to globally solve non-convex problems. However, this type of LP approximations for POPs are known to provide very weak approximation bounds for the objective value of the POP of interest [see, e.g., 8, 21]. To address this, we next propose the use of DSOS and SDSOS polynomials instead of the non-negative polynomials $c_{\alpha,\beta}$ in the definition of the hierarchy (9).

3.1 Alternative LP and SOCP Hierarchies for POPs

For a general polynomial optimization problem [PP-P] with feasible set $\S_\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n_+$, consider the following hierarchy of optimization problems:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}} = \quad \max \quad & \lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \sum_{j=1}^m g_j(x)\right)^r (f(x) - \lambda) = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{I}'} p_{\alpha,\beta}(x) x^\alpha g(x)^\beta, \qquad (10) \\ & p_{\alpha,\beta}(x) \in \mathcal{M}, \text{ for all } (\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{I}', \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}' := \{(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+m} : \|(\alpha,\beta)\|_1 = r \max\{\deg(g) : g \in \mathcal{G}\} + \deg(f) - 2\}.$$

For brevity, we use (10) to define three (3) approximation hierarchies for [PP-P]. Namely, for the cases in which $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$, $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$, and $\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$. Similar to Lasserre's hierarchy [PP-SOS$_r$], when $\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$ in (10), the associated optimization problems can be reformulated as a SDP. In turn, similar to the hierarchies [PP-$\underline{\text{DSOS}}_r$] and [PP-$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$] (cf., Section 2) when $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$, $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$ in (10), the associated optimization problems can be reformulated as a LP and as a SOCP respectively. Note that in the hierarchies discussed in Section 2, as the level of the hierarchy r increases, the complexity of checking that a fixed number (m) of polynomials are SOS, SDSOS, or DSOS increases. Instead in the hierarchy defined in (10) the complexity of checking that the involved SOS, SDSOS, or DSOS polynomials does not change as the degree of these polynomials is fixed to 2. Instead, it is the number of these polynomials that increases as the level of the hierarchy increases. This turns out to be key to obtain the results presented later in this section on the performance of the hierarchy (10) for different choices of the set $\mathcal{M}$.

Clearly, for the choices of $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$, $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$, and $\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$, hierarchy (10) provides a stronger bound on the associated POP than the LP based hierarchy [PP-LP$_r$]. In particular, under the same conditions of Theorem 2, these hierarchies will converge as $r \to \infty$ to the global optimal solution of [PP-P]. Below, we state this formally.

Theorem 3. *Consider problem [PP-P] and assume that $S_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ whose global optimal objective function is z^*, then it follows that for any $r = 1, \ldots$:*

$$z_{r,LP} \leq z_{r,\overline{DSOS}} \leq z_{r,\overline{SDSOS}} \leq z_{r,\overline{SOS}} \leq z^*.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} z_{r,\overline{DSOS}} = \lim_{r\to\infty} z_{r,\overline{SDSOS}} = \lim_{r\to\infty} z_{r,\overline{SOS}} = z^*.$$

3.2 Illustrative Examples

To illustrate the performance of the hierarchies discussed in Section 3.1, we apply them to a set of POPs from [14], which are highly non-convex and require a high level of Lasserre's hierarchy to converge to their global optimum. The implementation of the hierarchies is done using APPS [11] together with Matlab. All the numerical experiments are conducted on an AMD Opteron 2.0 GHz(x16) Linux machine with 32 GB memory. We use MOSEK as the solver for the hierarchies that require the solution of a LP or a SOCP, and SeDuMi as the solver for the hierarchies that require the solution of a SDP.

In the tables of numerical results that follow, the symbol (*) indicates that the reported value is the optimal objective function value.

Example 1. *Consider the following quadratic POP with 5 variables:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{x\in\mathbb{R}^5} \quad & -2x_1 + x_2 - x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & (x_1-2)^2 - x_2^2 - (x_3-1)^2 - (x_5-1)^2 \geq 0, \\
& x_1x_3 - x_4x_5 + x_1^2 \geq 1, \\
& x_3 - x_2^2 - x_4^2 \geq 1, \\
& x_1x_5 - x_2x_3 \geq 2, \\
& x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 \leq 14, \\
& x_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, 5.
\end{aligned}$$

The performance of hierarchy (10) for the different choices of $\mathcal{M}$ is shown in Table 3.1, and compared with Lasserre's hierarchy (cf., (2)). As shown in Table 3.1, Lasserre's hierarchy converges to the global optimum at the fourth level when $r = 8$ with a computational time of 37.32 seconds, while the hierarchy $z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$ (cf., (10)) with $\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$ converges to global optimum when $r = 6$ with only 3.94 seconds of computational time. The hierarchy $z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$ with $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$ also converges to the global optimum when $r = 8$ with 9.57 seconds of computational time. The hierarchy $z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$ with $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$ provides the weakest bound and does not converge to global optimum up by the fourth level of the hierarchy.

	[PP-SOS$_r$]		$z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$					
			$\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$	
r	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)
2	25.00	0.34	25.00	0.17	25.00	0.08	25.00	0.05
4	6.01	1.13	2.35	0.70	3.28	0.16	9.33	0.03
6	2.40	5.43	*1.57	3.94	1.62	1.79	2.86	0.64
8	*1.57	37.32			*1.57	9.57	1.88	15.83

Table 3.1: Comparison of Lasserre's Hierarchy and SOS, SDSOS, DSOS based Hierarchies for Example 1.

In Table 3.1, note that for the same level of hierarchy with $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$ and $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$, the linear representation of $DSOS_{n,2}$ introduces more decision variables than the SOCP representation of $SDSOS_{n,2}$. This explains why the running time of the LP-based hierarchy can be larger than the running time of the SOCP-based hierarchy.

Example 2. *Consider the following quadratic POP with 10 variables:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{x\in\mathbb{R}^{10}} \quad & x_1 + x_2 - x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 - x_6 - x_7 + x_8 - x_9 + 2x_{10} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & (x_3 - 2)^2 - (x_5 - 1)^2 - 2x_6 + x_8^2 - (x_9 - 2)^2 \geq -4, \\
& - x_2^2 + x_3x_{10} - x_4^2 + x_6x_7 \geq 1, \\
& x_1x_8 - x_2x_3 + x_4x_7 - x_5x_{10} \geq 2, \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i \leq 5, \\
& x_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, 10.
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Table 3.2, Lasserre's hierarchy converges to the global optimum at the third level when $r = 6$ with a computational time of 2689.30 seconds. In contrast, SOS-based hierarchy (i.e., (10) with $\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$) converges to the global optimum when $r = 4$ with 3.65 seconds of computational time. The SDSOS-based hierarchy (i.e., (10) with $\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$) also converges to the global optimum when $r = 4$ with 1.73 seconds of computational time. Similar to Example 1, the DSOS-based hierarchy (i.e., (10) with $\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$) provides the weakest bound and the global optimum is not reached by the third level of the hierarchy. We note however that the computational time at the third level is lower than that of Lasserre's hierarchy and the gap is less than 0.2%.

[PP-SOS$_r$]			$z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$					
			$\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$	
r	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)
2	10.00	0.13	10.00	0.26	10.00	0.02	10.00	0.08
4	7.76	13.46	*5.18	3.65	*5.18	1.73	5.49	0.25
6	*5.18	2689.30					5.19	25.00

Table 3.2: Comparison of Lasserre's Hierarchy and SOS, SDSOS, DSOS based Hierarchies for Example 2.

Example 3. *Consider the following quadratic POP with 15 variables:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max_{x\in\mathbf{R}^{15}} \quad & -x_1+x_2-x_3+x_4+x_5-x_6-x_7+x_8-x_9+x_{10}-x_{11}+x_{12}-x_{13}+x_{14}-x_{15}\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & (x_1-2)^2-x_2^2+(x_3-2)^2-(x_4-1)^2-(x_5-1)^2+(x_6-2)^2-(x_7-1)^2-x_8^2\\
& -(x_9-2)^2-(x_{10}-1)^2+x_{11}^2-x_{12}^2+(x_{13}-2)^2+x_{14}^2-(x_{15}-1)^2\geq 0,\\
& -x_1x_7-x_4x_5-x_3^2+x_6x_9+x_{10}x_{12}\geq 1,\\
& x_2x_3-x_8x_{11}-x_{14}^2+x_5x_{15}\geq 2,\\
& \sum_{i=1}^{15} x_i\leq 10,\\
& x_i\geq 0, i=1,\ldots,15.
\end{aligned}
$$

The results for Example 3 are shown in Table 3.3. Lasserre's hierarchy becomes computationally expensive when $r = 6$. In contrast, the SOS-based hierarchy converges to the global optimum when $r = 4$ with 743.49 seconds of computational time. The SDSOS-based hierarchy also converges to the global optimum with $r = 4$ requiring 66.17 seconds of computational time. The DSOS-based hierarchy provides a weak bound, with a gap of 3% at the third level of hierarchy but it is better than the second level bound of Lasserre's hierarchy.

[PP-SOS$_r$]			$z_{r,\overline{\mathcal{M}}}$					
			$\mathcal{M} = SOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = SDSOS_{n,2}$		$\mathcal{M} = DSOS_{n,2}$	
r	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)	Bound	Time(s.)
2	10.00	0.23	10.00	0.06	10.00	0.05	10.00	0.11
4	8.06	2754.30	*7.43	743.49	*7.43	66.17	8.45	0.45
6	$\star$	$\star$					7.64	2340.00

$\star$: Out of Memory.

Table 3.3: Comparison of Lasserre's Hierarchy and SOS, SDSOS, DSOS based Hierarchies for Example 3.

4 The Alternating Current Optimal Power Flow Problem

ACOPF optimizes the generation and the distribution of electric energy taking into account the active and reactive power generation limits, demand requirements, bus voltage limits, and network flow limits. Due to the non-linear power flow constraints, ACOPF can be formulated as a

non-convex polynomial program that is generally difficult to solve. A semidefinite programming formulation of the ACOPF problem has been presented in [3] and further extended in [16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 31] where optimal solutions are reported for several instances. A polynomial programming formulation for ACOPF has been presented in [18, 25] where the solution approach is based on using moments and sum-of-square decomposition to build hierarchies of improving SDP relaxations as proposed by [20]. As discussed earlier, such an approach is computationally expensive due to the size of the resulting semi-definite programs.

In this section, we apply the LP and SOCP hierarchies that are proposed in this paper to the alternating current optimal flow problem and we exploit the network structure of electricity transmission grids to specialize the proposed SOCP approximations for the ACOPF problem and obtain improving results. The results are compared to the SDP based hierarchy [20] and to the SOCP relaxation that is proposed in [5].

4.1 ACOPF Problem as a Polynomial Optimization Problem

To formulate the ACOPF problem as a polynomial problem, we follow the same notation as in [24, 26], i.e., we consider an undirected graph $P(N, E)$ where each vertex $n \in N$ is called a "bus" and each edge $e \in E$ is called a "branch". The subset $G \subseteq N$ denotes the set of generators. Additionally, we define the following parameters:

- $P_k^{\min}$ and $P_k^{\max}$ are the limits on active generation capacity at bus k.
- $Q_k^{\min}$ and $Q_k^{\max}$ are the limits on reactive generation capacity at bus k.
- $V_k^{\min}$ and $V_k^{\max}$ are the limits on the absolute value of the voltage at a given bus k.
- $S_{lm}^{\max}$ is the limit on the absolute value of the apparent power of a branch $(l, m) \in L$.
- P_k^d is the active power demand.
- Q_k^d is the reactive power demand.
- c_k^2, c_k^1, c_k^0 are nonnegative coefficients for the power generation cost function.

We also define the following decision variables

- P_k^g: active power generated at bus k.
- Q_k^g: reactive power generated at bus k.
- P_{lm}: active power flow on branch (l, m).
- Q_{lm}: reactive power flow on branch (l, m).

Given a complex voltage V_i at bus i, let $\Re V_i$ denote the real part of V_i and $\Im V_i$ denote the imaginary part. The power flow equations are

$$P_k^g = P_k^d + \Re V_k \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\Re y_{ik} \Re V_i - \Im y_{ik} \Im V_i) + \Im V_k \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\Im y_{ik} \Re V_i - \Re y_{ik} \Im V_i) \tag{11}$$

$$Q_k^g = Q_k^d + \Re V_k \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-\Im y_{ik} \Re V_i - \Re y_{ik} \Im V_i) + \Im V_k \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\Re y_{ik} \Re V_i - \Im y_{ik} \Im V_i) \tag{12}$$

$$P_{lm} = b_{lm}(\Re V_l \Im V_m - \Re V_m \Im V_l) + g_{lm}(\Re V_l{}^2 + \Im V_m{}^2 - \Im V_l \Im V_m - \Re V_l \Re V_m) \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{lm} = {} & b_{lm}(\Re V_l \Im V_m - \Im V_l \Im V_m - \Re V_l{}^2 - \Im V_l{}^2) + g_{lm}(\Re V_l \Im V_m - \Re V_m \Im V_l - \Re V_m \Im V_l) \\ & - \frac{\bar{b}_{lm}}{2}(\Re V_l{}^2 + \Im V_l{}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Additionally, the network admittance matrix and other related matrices are defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_k &= e_k e_k^T y, \\
y_{lm} &= (j\frac{\bar{b}_{lm}}{2} + g_{lm} + jb_{lm})e_l e_l^T - (g_{lm} + jb_{lm})e_l e_m^T, \\
Y_k &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \Re(y_k + y_k^T) & \Im(y_k^T - y_k) \\ \Im(y_k - y_k^T)) & \Re(y_k + y_k^T) \end{bmatrix}, \\
\bar{Y}_k &= -\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \Im(y_k + y_k^T) & \Re(y_k - y_k^T) \\ \Re(y_k^T - y_k) & \Im(y_k + y_k^T) \end{bmatrix}, \\
M_k &= \begin{bmatrix} e_k e_k^T & 0 \\ 0 & e_k e_k^T \end{bmatrix}, \\
Y_{lm} &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \Re(y_{lm} + y_{lm}^T) & \Im(y_{lm}^T - y_{lm}) \\ \Im(y_{lm} - y_{lm}^T) & \Re(y_{lm} + y_{lm}^T) \end{bmatrix}, \\
\bar{Y}_{lm} &= -\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \Im(y_{lm} + y_{lm}^T) & \Re(y_{lm}^T - y_{lm}) \\ \Re(y_{lm}^T - y_{lm}) & \Im(y_{lm} + y_{lm}^T) \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}
$$

where e_k is the k^{th} standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^{|N|}$. Let $x := [\Re V_k \quad \Im V_k]^T$ be the vector of variables in addition to the variables P_k^g, P_{lm} and Q_{lm}. The ACOPF can be formulated as the following degree-2 polynomial optimization problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{[PP-OPF]} \ \min \ & \sum_{k\in G}\left(c_k^2(P_k^g)^2 + c_k^1(P_k^d + \operatorname{tr}(Y_k x x^T)) + c_k^0\right) && (15)\\
\text{s.t.} \ & P_k^{\min} \le \operatorname{tr}(Y_k x x^T) + P_k^d \le P_k^{\max}, \ \forall k \in G, && (16)\\
& Q_k^{\min} \le \operatorname{tr}(\bar{Y}_k x x^T) + Q_k^d \le Q_k^{\max}, \ \forall k \in G, && (17)\\
& (V_k^{\min})^2 \le \operatorname{tr}(M_k x x^T) \le (V_k^{\max})^2, \ \forall k \in N, && (18)\\
& P_{lm}^2 + Q_{lm}^2 \le (S_{lm}^{\max})^2, \ \forall (l,m) \in L, && (19)\\
& P_k^g = \operatorname{tr}(Y_k x x^T) + P_k^d, \ \forall k \in G, && (20)\\
& P_{lm} = \operatorname{tr}(Y_{lm} x x^T), \ \forall (l,m) \in L, && (21)\\
& Q_{lm} = \operatorname{tr}(\bar{Y}_{lm} x x^T), \ \forall (l,m) \in L. && (22)
\end{aligned}
$$

The objective function (15) minimizes the cost of power generation. Constraitns (16), (17), and (18) set limits on the active power, reactive power, and voltage on each bus. Constraints (19) set a limit on the apparent power flow at every branch. Constraints (20) define the power generated while constraints (21), (22) define the active and reactive power flow. [PP-OPF] is a polynomial optimization problem of degree two and the proposed hierarchies are applicable to this problem. Additionally, the ACOPF problem exhibits a structure that can be exploited to improve the computational performance.

4.2 ACOPF as a Second-Order Cone Problem

By exploring the structure of the quadratic formulation of ACOPF, we have the following observations:

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathcal{X}_{ori}$ denote the set of x variables in [PP-OPF] and let $\mathcal{X}_{ext}$ denote the set of P_k^g, P_{lm}, and Q_{lm} variables. Then for $v_i \in \mathcal{X}_{ori}$ and $v_j \in \mathcal{X}_{ext}$,*

$$v_i v_j \text{ does not appear in the quadratic model [PP-OPF].}$$

Proposition 1 allows us to exploit the structure of ACOPF and develop specific hierarchies. Additionally, some product terms of variables in $\mathcal{X}_{ori}$ do not appear based on the network structure. For instance, buses i and j are connected if $(i,j) \in E$, and thus the network structure can be used to delete products of variables that are not needed in the formulation.

Proposition 2.

$$tr(Y_k x x^T) = \alpha_k \Re V_k^2 + \beta_k \Im V_k^2 + \sum_{j:(k,j)\in E} (\gamma_1^{kj} \Re V_k \Re V_k + \gamma_2^{kj} \Re V_k \Im V_j + \gamma_3^{kj} \Im V_k \Re V_j + \gamma_4^{kj} \Im V_k \Im V_j), \forall k \in N \tag{23}$$

where $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_1^{kj}, \gamma_2^{kj}, \gamma_3^{kj}, \gamma_4^{kj}$ *are parameters.*

Proof. Directly follows by exploring the structure of Y_k. □

Proposition 2 uses the branch information to simplify the hierarchy by removing unnecessary monomials. Only the cross product of voltages of two connected buses appear in $\text{tr}(Y_k x x^T)$, and the same goes for $\text{tr}(\bar{Y}_k x x^T)$ which means that there is no need to generate all the monomials in the right hand side of hierarchy [PP-$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$]. Since electricity transmission grids are normally sparse graphs then the number of SOCP constraints can be reduced significantly thus improving the computational performance. Additionally, the structure of the SOCP relaxation of ACOPF can be easily exploited since in each SOCP constraint of [PP-$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$], only a combination of two monomials is involved. For example, if the cross product $m_i m_j$ does not appear in the model, then for $d_0(x)$ in hierarchy [PP-$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$] the SOCP constraint related to $(\beta_i m_i + \beta_j m_j)^2$ is not needed.

4.2.1 Duality in ACOPF Formulations

It has been shown in [12, Theorem 1] that the first level of the SDP hierarchy obtained by using the [PP-SOS$_r$] on the quadratic POP formulation of the ACOPF problem, [PP-OPF], is equivalent to the conic dual of the SDP relaxation for the ACOPF problem considered in [24, Optimization 3]. In this section, we show that the first level of the [PP-$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$] hierarchy of the ACOPF problem is the conic dual problem of the SOCP relaxation of the ACOPF problem that is presented in [5]. Intuitively, this result follows from the fact that the conic dual of the SDD matrices (cf., (6)) is the set of symmetric matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that every 2×2 *principal submatrix* of A is positive semidefinite. Similar to (7), the latter condition can be formulated using the second-order cone; which corresponds to the relaxation approach used in [5]. Below, we state this result formally.

Theorem 4. *The first level of the SOCP hierarchy obtained by using the [PP-*$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$*] hierarchy on the quadratic POP formulation of the ACOPF problem, [PP-OPF], is equivalent to the conic dual of the SOCP relaxation for the ACOPF problem considered in [5].*

Proof. See the Appendix. □

Furthermore, for this pair of dual SOCP problems, strong duality holds.

Theorem 5. *Strong duality holds between the first level of the SOCP hierarchy obtained by using [PP-*$\underline{\text{SDSOS}}_r$*] on the quadratic POP formulation of the ACOPF problem and the SOCP relaxation for the ACOPF problem considered in [5].*

Proof. See the Appendix. □

4.3 Numerical Results on ACOPF Instances

In this section we apply the LP and the SOCP hierarchy to the quadratic formulation of the ACOPF problem [PP-OPF], and compare it with the SDP hierarchy based on Lasserre's approach [20], defined by setting $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{G}}^r$ as in (1). The SDP, SOCP, and LP based hierarchies are implemented in APPS [11] using Matlab, and SeDuMi and MOSEK are used as the SDP and the SOCP solvers respectively. The ACOPF instances are taken from [7, 33] and the results are summarized in Table 4.1. In computing the gaps, the best known bounds for the ACOPF instances are taken from [12]. Table 4.2 presents computational results of the structured SOCP approach where the structure of the ACOPF problem is exploited and a computational comparison with optimization problem R_2 of [5].

	Best	SDP hierarchy			SOCP hierarchy			LP hierarchy		
Instance	Bound	Bound	Time (s.)	Gap	Bound	Time (s.)	Gap	Bound	Time (s.)	Gap
case9Q	5297.4	5296.71	49.59	0.01%	5230.49	0.09	1.25%	4448.00	0.05	16.02%
case14	8081.7	8081.52	1.59	0.002%	7677.48	0.17	4.99%	6859.31	0.07	15.12%
case30	574.5	-	-	-	567.96	0.48	1.55%	373.93	0.36	35.18%
case39	41889.1	-	-	-	41276.26	0.95	1.40%	3495.12	0.40	91.65%
case57	41712.0	-	-	-	41144.28	1.69	1.42%	38822.46	0.28	6.98%
case118	129372.4	-	-	-	126001.18	8.17	2.82%	96774.44	0.49	25.36%
case300	720031.0	-	-	-	706616.52	81.69	1.82%	$\star$	$\star$	$\star$

Gap: Gap from best known SDP bounds in the first level.
$-$: Program not solved within 1 hour.
$\star$: Out of memory.

Table 4.1: Computational time comparison of first level SDP, SOCP and LP approximation.

	R_2		SOCP Approach		Structured SOCP		Structured SOCP Level 2	
instance	Bound	Time(s)	Bound	Time(s)	Bound	Time(s)	Bound	Time(s)
case9Q	5220.01	0.14	5230.49	0.09	5220.01	0.01	5298.89	27.15
case14	7661.05	0.15	7677.48	0.17	7659.96	0.08	7953.84	48.75
case30	567.79	0.43	567.96	0.48	567.79	0.31	$\star$	$\star$
case39	41283.67	0.55	41276.26	0.95	41278.11	0.51	$\star$	$\star$
case57	41157.72	0.38	41144.28	1.69	41157.72	0.26	$\star$	$\star$
case118	126072.18	0.95	126001.18	8.17	126050.17	0.71	$\star$	$\star$
case300	706779.64	2.62	706616.52	81.69	706779.64	1.57	$\star$	$\star$

$\star$: Out of memory.

Table 4.2: Computational time comparison of R_2 with SOCP and structured SOCP approximation.

From Tables 4.1-4.2, the SDP hierarchy (3rd, 4th, and 5th columns in Table 4.1), only bounds on instances up to 14 buses are solved within 1 hour using the first level of the hierarchy. By using the SOCP hierarchy (6th, 7th, and 8th columns in Table 4.1), we obtained lower bounds for instances of up to 300 buses using the first level of the hierarchy with an average gap of 2% from the best known bounds. Furthermore, the computational times for the SOCP approach are substantially reduced when one takes advantage the structure the ACOPF problem as described in Table 4.2, while obtaining a comparable lower bound to R_2. Note that there are slight numerical differences in the bounds due to numerical errors in the solvers.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we propose alternative LP and SOCP approximation hierarchies for general polynomial optimization problems, which can be used to obtain global bounds for these problems. Comparing with the classic Lasserre's hierarchy, the LP and SOCP approximation hierarchies are shown to be computationally more efficient to find the global optimum of POPs for which Lasserre's hierarchy is known to perform poorly. Furthermore, these hierarchies are shown to converge as the level of the hierarchy increases to the global optimum of the corresponding POP. Unlike other hierarchies proposed in the literature, this property is obtained whenever the feasible set of the POP is compact but the *Quadratic Module* of the polynomials defining the problems's feasible set is not necessarily *Archimedean*.

Also, we apply recently proposed LP and SOCP approximation hierarchies to the ACOPF problem. Numerical results on ACOPF instances from the literature show that the use of these hierarchies, together with the sparsity structure of the problem, allow the computation of global bounds for large-scale ACOPF problems where Lasserre's hierarchy fails to provide such bounds. Moreover, the first level of the SOCP hierarchy is shown to be equivalent to the dual of the SOCP relaxations proposed in [5] for these problems.

The fact that the hierarchies considered here are based on using SOCP and LP allows for the future use of column generation approaches in order to be able to address the solution of larger-scale POP problems.

Appendix

In this section, we provide a detailed proof of Theorem 4.

Proof. First, [PP-OPF] is reformulated as a polynomial optimization problem of the form given in (8). We notice that since not all the monomials appear in the polynomial formulation then using the first level of the SOCP hierarchy ($r = 2$), one can approximate [PP-OPF] as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max\ & \varphi \\
\text{s.t.}\ & \sum_{k\in N}\left(c_k^2(P_k^g)^2 + c_k^1(P_k^d + \mathrm{tr}(Y_k x x^T)) + c_k^0\right) - \varphi = S(x) + S(P^g) + S(P,Q) \\
& + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\lambda}_k\left(P_k^{\max} - P_k^d - \mathrm{tr}(Y_k x x^T)\right) + \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\lambda}_k\left(-P_k^{\min} + P_k^d + \mathrm{tr}(Y_k x x^T)\right) \\
& + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\gamma}_k\left(Q_k^{\max} - Q_k^d - \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k x x^T)\right) + \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\gamma}_k\left(-Q_k^{\min} + Q_k^d + \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k x x^T)\right) \\
& + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\mu}_k\left((V_k^{\max})^2 - \mathrm{tr}(M_k x x^T)\right) + \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\mu}_k\left((-V_k^{\min})^2 + \mathrm{tr}(M_k x x^T)\right) \\
& + \sum_{(l,m)\in L} a_{lm}\left((S_{lm}^{\max})^2 - P_{lm}^2 - Q_{lm}^2\right) + \sum_{k\in G} b_k\left(P_k^g - \mathrm{tr}(Y_k x x^T) - P_k^d\right) \\
& + \sum_{(l,m)\in L} c_{lm}\left(P_{lm} - \mathrm{tr}(Y_{lm} x x^T)\right) + \sum_{(l,m)\in L} d_{lm}\left(Q_{lm} - \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_{lm} x x^T)\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

$S(x)$ is a scaled diagonally dominant sum of square polynomial based on the branch information, and $S(P^g), S(P,Q)$ are polynomials that are scaled diagonally dominant sum of squares as a function of P_k^g, and P_{lm} and Q_{lm} respectively. Furthermore, by observation of the monomials in the objective function and constraints of [PP-OPF], we remove some unnecessary monomials in $S(x), S(P^g)$ and $S(P,Q)$ for simplicity. To be more specific, $x_k, \forall k \in N$ in $S(x)$, $P_i^g P_j^g, \forall i,j \in N, i \neq j$ in $S(P^g)$ and $P_{l_1,m_1}P_{l_2,m_2} \forall (l_1,m_1),(l_2,m_2) \in E, (l_1,m_1) \neq (l_2,m_2)$,

$Q_{l_1,m_1}Q_{l_2,m_2}\forall(l_1,m_1),(l_2,m_2)\in E,(l_1,m_1)\neq(l_2,m_2)$, $P_{l_1,m_1}Q_{l_2,m_2}\forall(l_1,m_1),(l_2,m_2)\in E$ in $S(P,Q)$ are not needed. Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(x) &= \alpha + \sum_{k\in N}\alpha_k x_k^2 + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}(\alpha_{lm}^1 x_l + \alpha_{lm}^2 x_m)^2,\\
S(P^g) &= \beta + \sum_{k\in N}\beta_k (P_k^g)^2 + \sum_{k\in N}(\beta_k^1 + \beta_k^2 P_k^g)^2,\\
S(P,Q) &= \theta + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}(\theta_{lm}P_{lm}^2 + \delta_{lm}Q_{lm}^2) + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}\left((\theta_{lm}^1 + \theta_{lm}^2 P_{lm})^2 + (\delta_{lm}^1 + \delta_{lm}^2 Q_{lm})^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Note that in this problem, the variables $\alpha,\beta,\theta,\alpha_k,\beta_k,\theta_{lm},\delta_{im},\overline{\lambda}_k,\underline{\lambda}_k,\overline{\gamma}_k,\underline{\gamma}_k,\overline{\mu}_k,\underline{\mu}_k$, and a_{lm} are non-negative variables and $\alpha_{lm}^1,\alpha_{lm}^2,\beta_k^1,\beta_k^2,\theta_{lm}^1,\theta_{lm}^2,\delta_{lm}^1,\delta_{lm}^2,b_k,c_{lm}$, and d_{lm} are free variables. As discussed in Section 2, a scaled diagonally dominant sum of square polynomial has a natural second order cone representation, so we can rewrite Equation (24) as

$$\begin{aligned}
S(x) &= \alpha + \sum_{k\in N}\alpha_k x_k^2 + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}\begin{pmatrix}x_l\\x_m\end{pmatrix}^T A_{lm}\begin{pmatrix}x_l\\x_m\end{pmatrix},\\
S(P^g) &= \beta + \sum_{k\in N}\beta_k (P_k^g)^2 + \sum_{k\in N}\begin{pmatrix}1\\P_k^g\end{pmatrix}^T B_k\begin{pmatrix}1\\P_k^g\end{pmatrix}\\
S(P,Q) &= \theta + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}(\theta_{lm}P_{lm}^2 + \delta_{lm}Q_{lm}^2) + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}\left(\begin{pmatrix}1\\P_{lm}\end{pmatrix}^T C_{lm}^1\begin{pmatrix}1\\P_{lm}\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}1\\Q_{lm}\end{pmatrix}^T C_{lm}^2\begin{pmatrix}1\\Q_{lm}\end{pmatrix}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

$A_{lm}, B_k^1, C_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^2$ are 2×2 positive semidefinite matrices which can be represented as second-order cone constraints. By equating the coefficients of the monomials of the above problem, we rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned}
\max\ & \varphi\\
\text{s.t.}\ & \sum_{k\in N}c_k^1 P_k^d + \sum_{k\in N}c_k^0 - \varphi = \alpha+\beta+\theta + \sum_{k\in N}B_k^{(11)} + \sum_{(l,m)\in E}(C_{lm}^{1(11)} + C_{lm}^{2(11)})\\
& + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\lambda}_k(P_k^{\max} - P_k^d) + \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\lambda}_k(-P_k^{\min} + P_k^d) + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\gamma}_k(Q_k^{\max} - Q_k^d) + \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\gamma}_k(-Q_k^{\min} + Q_k^d)\\
& + \sum_{k\in N}\overline{\mu}_k(V_k^{\max})^2 - \sum_{k\in N}\underline{\mu}_k(V_k^{\min})^2 + \sum_{(l,m)\in L}a_{lm}(S_{lm}^{\max})^2 - \sum_{k\in N}b_k P_k^d,\\
& \sum_{k\in N}c_k^1 Y_k^{(ij)} = A_{ij}^{(12)} - \sum_{k\in N}\Big(\overline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ij)} - \underline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ij)} + \overline{\gamma}_k\bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} - \underline{\gamma}_k\bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} - b_k Y_k^{(ij)}\\
& + \overline{\mu}_k M_k^{(ij)} - \underline{\mu}_k M_k^{(ij)}\Big) - \sum_{(l,m)\in L}\left(c_{lm}Y_{lm}^{(ij)} + d_{lm}\bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ij)}\right), \qquad \forall(i,j)\in E,\\
& \sum_{k\in N}c_k^1 Y_k^{(ii)} = \alpha_i + \sum_{i:(i,j)\in E}A_{ij}^{(11)} + \sum_{j:(i,j)\in E}A_{ij}^{(22)} - \sum_{k\in N}\Big(\overline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ii)} - \underline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ii)} + \overline{\gamma}_k\bar{Y}_k^{(ii)} - \underline{\gamma}_k\bar{Y}_k^{(ii)}\\
& - b_k Y_k^{(ii)} + \overline{\mu}_k M_k^{(ii)} - \underline{\mu}_k M_k^{(ii)}\Big) - \sum_{(l,m)\in L}\left(c_{lm}Y_{lm}^{(ii)} + d_{lm}\bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ii)}\right), \qquad \forall i\in N,\\
& 0 = 2B_k^{(12)} + b_k, \qquad \forall k\in N,\\
& c_k^2 = \beta_k + B_k^{(22)}, \qquad \forall k\in N,\\
& 0 = c_{lm} + 2C_{lm}^{1(12)}, \qquad \forall(l,m)\in E,\\
& 0 = d_{lm} + 2C_{lm}^{2(12)}, \qquad \forall(l,m)\in E,\\
& 0 = \theta_{lm} - a_{lm} + C_{lm}^{1(22)}, \qquad \forall(l,m)\in E,
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 = \delta_{lm} - a_{lm} + C_{lm}^{2(22)}, \qquad \forall (l,m) \in E, \\
& \alpha, \beta, \theta \geq 0, \\
& \alpha_k, \beta_k, a_{lm}, \overline{\lambda}_k, \underline{\lambda}_k, \overline{\gamma}_k, \underline{\gamma}_k, \overline{\mu}_k, \underline{\mu}_k \geq 0, \qquad \forall k \in N, \\
& \theta_{lm}, \delta_{lm} \geq 0, \qquad \forall (l,m) \in E, \\
& B_k \succeq 0, \qquad \forall k \in N, \\
& A_{lm}, C_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^2 \succeq 0, \qquad \forall (l,m) \in E,
\end{aligned}
$$

Define η as $\eta = \alpha + \beta + \theta$, for ease of notation. By substituting variables $a_{lm}, b_k, c_{lm}, d_{lm}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{k \in G} c_k^1 P_k^d + \sum_{k \in G} c_k^0 - \left(\eta + \sum_{k \in N} B_k^{(11)} + \sum_{(l,m) \in E} (C_{lm}^{1(11)} + C_{lm}^{2(11)}) \right) - \sum_{k \in N} \overline{\lambda}_k (P_k^{\max} - P_k^d) \\
& - \sum_{k \in N} \underline{\lambda}_k (-P_k^{\min} + P_k^d) - \sum_{k \in N} \overline{\gamma}_k (Q_k^{\max} - Q_k^d) - \sum_{k \in N} \underline{\gamma}_k (-Q_k^{\min} + Q_k^d) \\
& - \sum_{k \in N} \overline{\mu}_k (V_k^{\max})^2 + \sum_{k \in N} \underline{\mu}_k (V_k^{\min})^2 - \sum_{(l,m) \in L} (\theta_{lm} + C_{lm}^{1(22})(S_{lm}^{\max})^2 - \sum_{k \in G} 2B_k^{1(12)} P_k^d \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & A_{ij}^{(12)} = \sum_{k \in N} c_k^1 Y_k^{(ij)} + \sum_{k \in N} \left(\overline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ij)} - \underline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ij)} + \overline{\gamma}_k \bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} - \underline{\gamma}_k \bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} + 2B_k^{1(12)} Y_k^{(ij)} \right) \\
& + \sum_{(l,m) \in L} \left(2C_{lm}^{1(12)} Y_{lm}^{(ij)} + 2C_{lm}^{2(12)} \bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ij)} \right), \qquad \forall (i,j) \in E, \\
& \alpha_i + \sum_{i:(i,j) \in E} A_{ij}^{(11)} + \sum_{j:(i,j) \in E} A_{ij}^{(22)} = \sum_{k \in N} c_k^1 Y_k^{(ii)} + \sum_{k \in N} \left(\overline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ii)} - \underline{\lambda}_k Y_k^{(ii)} + \overline{\gamma}_k \bar{Y}_k^{(ii)} \right. \qquad (25) \\
& \left. - \underline{\gamma}_k \bar{Y}_k^{(ii)} + 2B_k^{1(12)} Y_k^{(ii)} + \overline{\mu}_k - \underline{\mu}_k \right) + \sum_{(l,m) \in L} \left(2C_{lm}^{1(12)} Y_{lm}^{(ii)} + 2C_{lm}^{2(12)} \bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ii)} \right), \ \forall i \in N, \\
& c_k^2 = \beta_k + B_k^{(22)}, \qquad \forall k \in N, \\
& \theta_{lm} + C_{lm}^{1(22)} - \delta_{lm} - C_{lm}^{2(22)} = 0, \qquad \forall (l,m) \in E, \\
& \eta \geq 0, \\
& \alpha_k, \beta_k, \overline{\lambda}_k, \underline{\lambda}_k, \overline{\gamma}_k, \underline{\gamma}_k, \overline{\mu}_k, \underline{\mu}_k \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in N, \\
& \theta_{lm}, \delta_{lm} \geq 0, \quad \forall (l,m) \in E, \\
& B_k \succeq 0, \quad \forall k \in N, \\
& A_{lm}, C_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^2 \succeq 0, \quad \forall (l,m) \in E.
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we derive the dual of Problem $\mathcal{R}_2$ in [5]. In [5], the authors also use the notations in [24]. Also note that for ease of presentation, the authors omit some refinements (such as the shunt element) in their model. We present the model of Problem $\mathcal{R}_2$ in [5] derived from Optimization

3 in [24] as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{k\in N} \alpha_k \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & P_k^{\min} \le \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) + P_k^d \le P_k^{\max},\ \forall k \in N, \\
& Q_k^{\min} \le \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k^e W_e) + Q_k^d \le Q_k^{\max},\ \forall k \in N, \\
& (V_k^{\min})^2 \le \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(M_k^e W_e) \le (V_k^{\max})^2,\ \forall k \in N, \\
& Z_k = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_k - c_{k1} \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) - a_k & \sqrt{c_{k2}} \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) + b_k \\ \sqrt{c_{k2}} \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) + b_k & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0,\ k \in N \\
& Z_{lm}^1 = \begin{bmatrix} S_{lm,\max}^2 & \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) \\ \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0,\ \forall (l,m) \in E \\
& Z_{lm}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} S_{lm,\max}^2 & \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k^e W_e) \\ \sum\limits_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k^e W_e) & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0,\ \forall (l,m) \in E \\
& W_e \succeq 0,\ \forall e \in E,
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}
$$

where $\mathrm{tr}(Y_k W)$ in Optimization 3 [24] is replaced by $\sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e)$ and we relax constraint (5) in Optimization 3 [24] to two second-order cone constraints Z_{lm}^1, Z_{lm}^2. So basically, optimization problem (26) is a relaxation of Optimization 3 in [24] in terms of the variable W_e. The Lagrangian function of optimization problem (26) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}(W,Z,\alpha,\lambda,\gamma,\mu,\eta,A,B,C) = \\
&\quad \sum_{k\in G} \alpha_k + \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(W_e, A_e) + \sum_{k\in N} \mathrm{tr}(Z_k, B_k) + \sum_{(l,m)\in E} \left(\mathrm{tr}(Z_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^1) + \mathrm{tr}(Z_{lm}^2, C_{lm}^2)\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k\in N} \overline{\lambda}_k \left(P_k^{\max} - P_k^d - \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) \right) + \sum_{k\in N} \underline{\lambda}_k \left(-P_k^{\min} + P_k^d + \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(Y_k^e W_e) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k\in N} \overline{\gamma}_k \left(Q_k^{\max} - Q_k^d - \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k^e W_e) \right) + \sum_{k\in N} \underline{\gamma}_k \left(-Q_k^{\min} + Q_k^d + \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(\bar{Y}_k^e W_e) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k\in N} \overline{\mu}_k \left((V_k^{\max})^2 - \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(M_k^e W_e) \right) + \sum_{k\in N} \underline{\mu}_k \left((-V_k^{\min})^2 + \sum_{e\in E} \mathrm{tr}(M_k^e W_e) \right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $A_e, B_k, C_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^2$ are 2×2 positive semidefinite matrices and $\lambda, \gamma, \mu, \eta$ are nonnegative Lagrangian multipliers. Therefore the Lagrangian dual of optimization problem (26) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max_{\lambda,\gamma,\mu,\eta,A,B,C} \quad & \min_{W,Z\succeq 0,\alpha} \mathcal{L}(W,Z,\alpha,\lambda,\gamma,\mu,\eta,A,B,C) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda,\gamma,\mu,\eta \ge 0 \\
& A_e \succeq 0,\ \forall e \in E, \\
& B_k \succeq 0,\ \forall k \in N, \\
& C_{lm}^1, C_{lm}^2 \succeq 0,\ \forall (l,m) \in E.
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

Once expanded, problem (27) has the same structure to the first level SOCP hierarchy for [PP-OPF], with exactly the same conic constraints. □

Next we prove the strong duality in Theorem 5.

Proof. In order to prove strong conic duality, we need to find a strict feasible solution for either the primal or dual problem. For the dual SOCP problem (25), consider the following point,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta > 0,\\
&\alpha_k = |E|_{max} + 1 - |E_k| > 0, \beta_k = c_k^2 - \epsilon > 0, \quad \forall k \in N,\\
&\theta_{lm} = \delta_{lm} = 1, \quad \forall (l,m) \in E,\\
&\underline{\lambda}_k = c_k^1 + \Lambda > 0, \overline{\lambda}_k = \Lambda, \underline{\gamma}_k = \overline{\gamma}_k = 1, \quad \forall k \in N,\\
&\overline{\mu}_k = 1 + \frac{1 + |E|_{max}}{|N|} > 0, \underline{\mu}_k = 1, \quad \forall k \in N,\\
&B_k = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \forall k \in N,\\
&A_{lm} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, C_{lm}^1 = C_{lm}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \forall (l,m) \in E.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In (28), $|E_k|$ is the number of edges whose endpoints contain node k, $|E|_{max} = \max\{|E_k|, k \in N\}$, for a fixed graph, $|E_k|, |E|_{max}$ are parameters; ϵ is a sufficient small positive number such that $c_k^2 - \epsilon > 0, \forall k \in N$, as c_k^2 is a positive parameter; Λ is a sufficient large positive number such that $c_k^1 + \Lambda > 0$. We substitute (28) into constraints (25).

$$\begin{aligned}
RHS &= \sum_{k \in N} c_k^1 Y_k^{(ij)} + \sum_{k \in N} \left(\Lambda Y_k^{(ij)} - (c_k^1 + \Lambda) Y_k^{(ij)} + \bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} - \bar{Y}_k^{(ij)} + 2 \times 0 \times Y_k^{(ij)} \right)\\
&+ \sum_{(l,m) \in L} \left(2 \times 0 \times Y_{lm}^{(ij)} + 2 \times 0 \times \bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ij)} \right)\\
&= 0\\
&= A_{ij}^{(12)} = LHS, \quad \forall (i,j) \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
RHS &= \sum_{k \in N} c_k^1 Y_k^{(ii)} + \sum_{k \in N} \left(\Delta Y_k^{(ii)} - (c_k^1 + \Delta) Y_k^{(ii)} + \bar{Y}_k^{(ii)} - \bar{Y}_k^{(ii)} + 2 \times 0 \times Y_k^{(ij)} \right)\\
&+ \sum_{k \in N} \left(1 + \frac{1 + |E|_{max}}{|N|} - 1 \right) + \sum_{(l,m) \in L} \left(2 \times 0 \times Y_{lm}^{(ij)} + 2 \times 0 \times \bar{Y}_{lm}^{(ij)} \right)\\
&= 1 + |E|_{max}\\
&= (|E|_{max} + 1 - |E_k|) + 0.5|E_k| + 0.5|E_k|\\
&= \alpha_i + \sum_{i:(i,j) \in E} A_{ij}^{(11)} + \sum_{j:(i,j) \in E} A_{ij}^{(22)} = LHS, \quad \forall i \in N.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
RHS &= \beta_k + B_k^{(22)}\\
&= c_k^2 - \epsilon + \epsilon\\
&= c_k^2 = LHS, \quad \forall k \in N.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS &= 1 + 1 - 1 - 1\\
&= 0 = RHS, \quad \forall (i,j) \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

The point satisfies all the constraints, at the same time, it is straightforward to see that the point is in the interior of the cone, which means point (28) is a strict feasible point for problem (25). Therefore, strong duality holds for Theorem 5. □

References

[1] Ahmadi, A. and Majumdar, A. (2014). DSOS and SDSOS: more tractable alternatives to sum of squares and semidefinite optimization. *In preparation*.

[2] Anjos, M. and Lasserre, J. B., editors (2012). *Handbook on Semidefinite, Conic and Polynomial Optimization Handbook on Semidefinite, Conic and Polynomial Optimization*, volume 166 of *International Series in Operations Research & Management Science*. Springer.

[3] Bai, X., Wei, H., Fujisawa, K., and Wang, Y. (2008). Semidefinite programming for optimal power flow problems. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 30(6):383–392.

[4] Blekherman, G., Parrilo, P., and Thomas, R. (2012). *Semidefinite Optimization and Convex Algebraic Geometry*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

[5] Bose, S., Low, S., Teeraratkul, T., and Hassibi, B. (2015). Equivalent relaxations of optimal power flow. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(3):729–742.

[6] Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L. (2009). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.

[7] Bukhsh, W., Grothey, A., McKinnon, K., and Trodden, P. (2013). Local solutions of the optimal power flow problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4):4780–4788.

[8] de Klerk, E. and Pasechnik, D. (2002). Approximation of the stability number of a graph via copositive programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimimization*, 12(4):875–892.

[9] de Klerk, E. and Sotirov, R. (2010). Exploiting group symmetry in semidefinite programming relaxations of the quadratic assignment problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 122(2):225–246.

[10] Gatermann, K. and Parrilo, P. (2004). Symmetry groups, semidefinite programs, and sums of squares. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 192(1-3):95–128.

[11] Ghaddar, B. (2011). New conic optimization techniques for solving binary polynomial programming problem. *PhD thesis*.

[12] Ghaddar, B., Marecek, J., and Mevissen, M. (2015a). Optimal power flow as a polynomial optimization problem. *to appear in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*.

[13] Ghaddar, B., Vera, J. C., and Anjos, M. F. (2011). Second-order cone relaxations for binary quadratic polynomial programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(1):391–414.

[14] Ghaddar, B., Vera, J. C., and Anjos, M. F. (2015b). A dynamic inequality generation scheme for polynomial programming. *to appear in Mathematical Programming (Series A)*.

[15] Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E., and Pólya, G. (1988). *Inequalities*. Cambridge Mathematical Library.

[16] Jabr, R. (2012a). Exploiting sparsity in sdp relaxations of the opf problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(2):1138–1139.

[17] Jabr, R. (2012b). Solution to economic dispatching with disjoint feasible regions via semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(1):572–573.

[18] Josz, C., Maeght, J., Panciatici, P., and Gilbert, J. (2015). Application of the moment-sos approach to global optimization of the opf problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 30(1):463–470.

[19] Kojima, M., Kim, S., and Waki, H. (2003). Sparsity in sums of squares of polynomials. *Mathematical Programming*, 103(1):45–62.

[20] Lasserre, J. B. (2001). Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(3):796–817.

[21] Lasserre, J. B. (2002). Semidefinite programming vs. lp relaxations for polynomial programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 27(2):347–360.

[22] Lasserre, J. B. (2009). Moments and sums of squares for polynomial optimization and related problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 45(1):39–61.

[23] Lavaei, J. and Low, S. H. (2010). Convexification of optimal power flow problem. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 223–232. IEEE.

[24] Lavaei, J. and Low, S. H. (2012). Zero duality gap in optimal power flow problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(1):92–107.

[25] Molzahn, D. and Hiskens, I. (2014). Moment-based relaxation of the optimal power flow problem. In *Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC), 2014*, pages 1–7.

[26] Molzahn, D. K., Holzer, J. T., Lesieutre, B. C., and DeMarco, C. L. (2013). Implementation of a large-scale optimal power flow solver based on semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4):3987–3998.

[27] Murty, K. G. and Kabadi, S. N. (1987). Some np-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Mathematical programming*, 39(2):117–129.

[28] Peña, J., Vera, J. C., and Zuluaga, L. F. (2014). A certificate of non-negativity for polynomials over unbounded sets. *Mathematics of Operations Research*.

[29] Putinar, M. (1993). Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42:969–984.

[30] Schmüdgen, K. (1991). The K-moment problem for compact semi-algebraic sets. *Math. Ann.*, 289:203–206.

[31] Sojoudi, S. and Lavaei, J. (2014). Exactness of semidefinite relaxations for nonlinear optimization problems with underlying graph structure. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):1746–1778.

[32] Todd, M. (2001). Semidefinite optimization. *Acta Numerica*, 10:515–560.

[33] University of Washington (2015). Power systems test case archive. *http://www.ee.washington.edu/research/pstca/*.

[34] Zuluaga, L., Vera, J., and Peña, J. (2006). LMI approximations for cones of positive semidefinite forms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 16:1076–1091.